



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AREOPAGUS AND PLEIADE.

THE purpose of this paper is to emphasize a certain parallelism of programme and performance between Ronsard's *Pleiade* and that literary club to which Spenser in his letter to Harvey of Oct. 5, 1579, gives the name of *Areopagus*. It will not be possible to produce the lines of this parallelism far enough to do it justice: my space forbids. I hope at least to show cause why the two dominant schools of literature of Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century should not be studied apart.

In 1549 the elder of these two schools gave out its pronunciamiento in Du Bellay's *La Deffence et Illustration de la Langue françoise*. By 1579 the younger school had prepared its programme in Spenser's *The English Poet*. We can only infer, but we can readily enough infer, the main tenets of *The English Poet* from 'E. K.'s' references in the *Shepheards Calender*. These inferential doctrines of *The English Poet* exactly conform with the known doctrines of Sidney's *Defense of Poesie*. It has even been surmised, not without plausibility, that the former essay was actually digested into the latter.¹

Du Bellay's *Deffence* and the mass of literary performance built up on its theoretical bases by himself and his friends represent a concerted propagandist movement of literary reform. Endeavoring to trim between the two offensively partisan camps in French literature, between the humanist critics slavishly tied to the letter of the classics and the nationalist critics with their patriotic but crude medievalism, the *Pleiade* ostensibly basing itself upon a free reconstructive imitation of the classics, actually developed a third party, essentially eclectic in spirit and method.

¹ Grosart. *Spenser's Works*. Spenser Soc. 1882-4, Vol. I, pp. 453-4.

It will not be denied that in English literature there was at the end of the third quarter of the century a like tension; nor yet denied that individually and in a general way Sidney and Spenser attempted to harmonize medievalism and classicism. Their functional likeness to Du Bellay and Ronsard, indeed, has not passed unnoticed, could not pass unnoticed. Mr. Hannay, for instance, observes that Sidney's *Defense*, or *Apologie for Poetrie*, 'is to some extent our English equivalent for the *Deffense et Illustration de la Langue Française* of Joachim du Bellay, the manifesto of a new school of poets'; and again that Ronsard 'did for France what Surrey and Wyatt began, and Spenser and Sidney completed for us, . . . set up a model of sweeter and statelier measures, and . . . brought the ancient classic inspiration out of pure scholarship into literature.'¹ This statement implies evidently no more than coincidence in the relationship whether between the French and the English poets or between the English poets themselves; and such I conceive to be the general opinion. There are, however, I think, reasons for inferring more, namely that there existed an English group of literary reformers, organized like the French group, and itself a conscious following of the French group.

What we know of the *Areopagus* is derived from references and allusions to it in the Spenser-Harvey letters of 1579-80. There we hear of Dyer and Fulke Greville as members besides Sidney and Spenser and the non-resident Harvey. The only business of the club directly dwelt on between Spenser and Harvey is the experimentation with classical metres. On this evidence, or absence of evidence, it has been generally assumed that the *Areopagus* could have had no other interest. Fox Bourne, indeed, justly complains that 'this part of the task taken upon itself by the *Areopagus* has been more ridiculed, and has been made to appear more important, than there is reason for.'² It is certainly hard to conceive the authors of the

¹ *The Later Renaissance*. New York, 1898, p. 200 and p. 298.

² H. R. Fox Bourne: *Sir Philip Sidney*. N. Y., 1891, p. 201.

Shepheards Calender and the *Fairie Queene*, of the *Defense of Poesie* and the *Arcadia*, in the very years in which those works were being planned and executed, finding no more fruitful basis for conversation and coöperation than the 'Dranting' of English verse.

If Spenser and Sidney in this time of mutual intercourse did not put their heads together for larger ends, it is a noteworthy coincidence that the *Defense of Poesie* should have followed so close upon the heels of *The English Poet*. Were the two treatises shown to have urged contrary views, they would still by the very presence of such an issue point to previous discussion between the two friends on matters broader than metrics. In point of fact, the two treatises present the same view. They both urge the inspirational idealism of Plato. Sidney's whole argument, both as a rebuttal of Gosson and as a critical construction, depends upon a *distinguo*. Gosson had declared with literal accuracy that Plato had banned poets. Sidney retorted with the well-known distinction in kinds of imitation,—the imitation which appeals to the senses merely and the imitation which appeals through the senses to the soul. The object of this higher imitation is not perceived, but apperceived; not learnt, but inspired. 'The ancient learned affirm it (poetry) was a divine gift, and no human skill, since all other knowledges lie ready for any that hath strength of wit, a poet no industry can make if his own genius be not carried into it.'¹

This bardic notion of the poet is Sidney's major premiss. It is similarly basic in Spenser's *The English Poet*. 'Poetry is . . . rather no arte, but a divine gift and heavenly instinct not to be gotten by laboure and learning, but adorned with both: and poured into the witte by a certain 'Ενθουσιασμός and celestiall inspiration, as the Author hereof els where at large discourseth in his booke called THE ENGLISH POETE . . .'²

The simultaneous enunciation of a root principle of their art not currently accepted in their time and place

¹ *Defense of Poesie*. Ed. A. S. Cook, p. 46.

² *Shep. Cal.* Ed. C. H. Herford. Ecl. 10, *Argument*.

by two friends known to be leaders of a literary reform-club can hardly be regarded as other than concerted action. What share the other members of the club may have taken in the propaganda I cannot at present say, but Harvey from one point of view seems to have advised and criticised much in the same way as the academic 'doyen' of the *Pleiade*, Daurat; from another point of view, he was urging the same metristic plank in the new platform as Baif in the French party.

If we may, at least provisionally, regard the *Areopagus* as a club devoted to general literary reform, the question naturally arises whether it was an original departure or a following. Fox Bourne assumes the former, since 'we have no account of any literary club like the *Areopagus*.'¹ Just over the channel a 'literary club like the *Areopagus*' had dominated for a generation the dominant literature of the age!

There was every reason that the *Pleiade* should have a following in England. Ronsard was a favorite with Queen Elizabeth, and a personal friend not only of Sidney's uncle, the Earl of Leicester, whom Ronsard in a complimentary poem called '*l'ornement des Anglois*,' but also of Sidney himself, who in 1572 had visited at the Louvre at the very time that Ronsard himself was staying there.² Spenser, as is well known, began his literary career by translating for Vander Noodt's '*Theatre for Worldlings*' the *Songe* from Du Bellay's *Antiquitez du Rome*, and later published a translation of that entire poem together with his own *Ruines of Time and Visions of the Worlds Vanity* in obvious emulation. Furthermore, it could not fail to be brought in upon the notice of so intimate a courtier as Sidney that the Queen was envious of the lustre which Ronsard at Paris, and Tasso at Ferrara, were shedding upon their respective sovereigns. As late as 1584, the Ferrarese ambassador in London is informed '*che questa reina non stima meno avventuroso il Serenissimo nostro Duca per avere cotesto gran poeta cantate le sue loda, che*

¹ Op. cit., p. 201.

² See J.-J. Jusserand in *Nineteenth Century*. April, 1898.

si facesse Alessandro Achille, per avere egli avuto il grande Omero.'¹ Even in '84 the greatly vain Queen must have felt the contrast of her own Homer-less state. Indeed, Sidney himself *may* have been the '*illustre cavaliere*' who informed Castelvetro of the Queen's admiration of Tasso.

If Sidney and his friends did take the *Pleiade* as a model for their own incubator of poets, they certainly chose an appropriately analogous name, Greek in origin like *Pleiade*; and if an Alexandrian literary coterie stood sponsor to the *Pleiade*, an Athenian tribunal of morals and education did as much for the *Areopagus*.

Behind and beneath these surface analogies, however, are the apparent identities of purpose and performance which the two coterie exhibit in their respective published works. Some of these identities it will be the intention of the rest of this paper to set forth, although hardly more than by suggestion.

First of all, it is clear that both Du Bellay's *Deffence* and Sidney's *Defense* mediate in like manner between the friends and the opponents of classical imitation by a similar distinction between literal and what they both indicate as *digestive* imitation. After flaying the bad literal imitation of the humanist poets, Du Bellay enjoins the free manner of the Romans imitating the Greeks, 'se transformant en eux, les deuorant, & apres les auoir bien digerez, les conuertissant en sang et nourriture: se proposant, chacun selon son Naturel, & l'Argument qu'il vouloit elire, le meilleur Aucteur . . .'² And Sidney, with evident echo: 'Truly I could wish . . . the diligent imitators of Tully and Demosthenes (most worthy to be imitated) did not so much keep Nizolian paper-books of their figures and phrases, as by attentive translation, as it were devour them whole, and make them wholly theirs.'³

¹ Cited in *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, by A. Solerti. 1885. Vol. II, Pe. II, Letter 179.

² *La Deffence*, &c., in *Oeuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux. Paris, 1866. T. I., p. 16 ff. (ch. vii).

³ *Defense of Poesy*, ed A. S. Cook. Ginn, Boston. 1890, p. 53. Prof. Cook in his Notes calls attention to the evident parallelism between these two passages of Du Bellay's and Sidney's.

The slavish imitation of the humanist, however, depended upon a more vital misconception than of mere literary methods. He forgot that before the poet can imitate or do anything else, the poet must be; and that no recipe save God's can make him. I have already illustrated the inspirational theory of the leading *Areopagites*¹; Ronsard for the *Pleiade* expresses the same view thus:

Le don de poésie est semblable à ce feu
 Lequel aux nuits d'hiver comme un présage est veu
 Ores dessus un fleuve, ores sur un pré,
 Ores dessus le chef d'une forest sacrée,
 Sautant et jaillissant, jetant de tous pars
 Par l'obscur de la nuit de grands rayons espars.²

While the poetic flame is thus likened to the *ignis fatuus* coming we know not whence, it must nevertheless be assiduously nursed. It is not, as Spenser says, 'gotten by labour and learning, but adorned with both.' Mere 'native wood-notes wild' will not do. So Du Bellay, when he censures those easy-going geniuses, '*poètes de cour*,' who are content to be led

Par le seul naturel, sans art et sans doctrine.³

And Spenser's *Polyhymnia* weeps

For the sweet numbers and melodious measures,
 With which I wont the winged words to tie,
 And make a tuneful Diapase of pleasures,
 Now being let to run at libertie
 By those which have no skill to rule them right,
 Have now quite lost their natural! delight.⁴

¹ Ante, p. 431.

² *Poèmes, Disc. à J. Grévin.*

³ Cited in Lanson: *Hist. Litt. Fr.*, p. 273.

⁴ *Tears of the Muses*, vv. 547-552. Sidney may seem to have defended *le seul naturel* when he exclaimed

Fool! said my Muse to me, look in thy heart, and write.

In point of fact he did look in his *Petrarchino*.

In fine, between the laborious humanist and the *insouciant* balladist or court poet, the dual reform mediated by eclectic combination. To put it Elizabethan-wise: it is true, *poeta nascitur non fit*; ergo, once *nascitur*, it devolves upon him to *fit* himself. Neither mere learning, nor mere inspiration,—both. But to what end is his fitting? The New School prepares no mere *gai saber*, no mere minstrel to share the perquisites and maybe the motley of the Court Fool. Its graduate is to be equally removed from the pedant and the jester. He is rather to be the priest, filled like Spenser's own Una with sad, sober cheer. Poetry is to be religion made vocal. Poets are to be the dispensers of immortality. Be of good cheer, cries Spenser to one that had lost her husband,

Thy Lord shall never die, the whiles this verse
Shall live, and surely it shall live for ever.¹

Kings recognize the priestly function of the New Poet: Charles IX writes to Ronsard,

Tous deux également nous portons des couronnes :
Mais, roi, je la reçus : poète, tu la donnes . . .²

Both Spenser and Ronsard recognizé that their elevation of the poet is a rehabilitation; one of the Muses complains to Ronsard:

Au temps que les mortels craignaient les deitez,
Ils bastirent pour nous et temples et citez ;
Montaignes et rochers et fontaines et préès
Et grottes et forests nous furent consacrées.
Notre mestier estoit d'honnorer les grands rois,
De rendre venerable et le peuple et les lois,
Faire que la vertu du monde fust aimée
Et forcer le trespas par longue renommée,
D'une flamme divine allumer les esprits,
Avoir d'un coeur hautain le vulgaire à mepris,
Ne priser que l'honneur et la gloire cherchée
Et tousjours dans le ciel avoir l'âme attachée.³

¹ *The Ruines of Time*, vv. 253-4.

² Cited in Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

³ *Bocage Royal. Dialogue entre les Muses deslogées et Ronsard.*

Just so Spenser's *Polyhymnia* complains to him of the evil days on which her art had fallen :

Whilom in ages past none might professe
But Princes and high Priests that secret skill ;
The sacred lawes therein they wont expresse,
And with deepe Oracles their verses fill :
Then was shee held in soveraigne dignitie,
And made the noursling of Nobilitie.

But now nor Prince nor Priest doth her maintayne,
But suffer her prophaned for to bee
Of the base vulgar, that with hands uncleane
Dares to pollute her hidden mysterie ;
And treadeth under foote hir holie things,
Which was the care of Kesars and of Kings.¹

This priestly or bardic function of the poet is to be revived. But *noblesse oblige*: the bard must speak as a bard and not as an ordinary man. Poetry must have a speech apart. It is Wordsworth's war-cry read backwards: let there be a 'poetic diction.' To defend and define such a new 'poetic diction' is the chief purpose of Du Bellay's *Deffence*, as it also is of 'E. K.'s' *Epistle-Dedictory* to Harvey in the *Shepheards Calender*.

However divinely inspired its framers, a 'poetic diction' cannot be created *ex nihilo*; it cannot even be a wholly artificial construction *à la* Volapuk. It may soar above everyday speech; it must not outfly intelligent understanding. The eclectic reformers of *Pleiade* and *Areopagus* heard about them in poetry, vulgarity on the one hand, pedantry on the other. The right way was evidently between. Popular diction and humanist diction both were partly right; their common fault was one-sidedness. Poetic diction must not be either all home-bred, or all learned, but both in due proportion. The literary vocabulary was to be enriched (*illustré*) by an equitable addition from both classes of terms. *Home-spun* revivals were to include (1) archaisms, and (2) dialectical

¹ *Tears of the Muses*, vv. 559-570.

terms and phrases; *learned* accretions were to come from (1) naturalised importations from foreign tongues, ancient and modern, (2) technical terms from the arts and sciences, and (3) new coinages.¹

By the intersprinkling of such 'seld-seen costly words' the Trimmers hoped to elevate the common vocabulary without rendering it unintelligible to the intelligent,—and for the rest what mattered? 'Seulement veux-je admonnester celuy qui aspire a une gloyre non vulgaire, s'eloingner de ces ineptes Admirateurs, fuyr ce peuple ignorant, peuple ennemy de tout rare & antique scauoir: se contenter de peu de Lecteurs a l'exemple de celuy qui pour tous Auditeurs ne demandoit que Platon . . .'² Spenser laments that Prince and Priest neglect Poetry,

. . . suffer her prophaned for to bee
Of the base vulgar, &c.³

Sidney exactly parallels this complaint of Spenser: 'How can I but exclaim,

Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso?

Sweet poesy! that hath anciently had kings, emperors, senators, great captains, such as, besides a thousand others, David, Adrian, Sophocles, Germanicus, not only to favor poets, but to be poets . . . (Now) base men with servile wits undertake it, who think it enough if they can be rewarded of the printer . . . So these men, no more but setting their names to it, by their own disgracefulness disgrace the most graceful poesy.'⁴ It is clear from all

¹ It is obviously impossible to prove in detail this analysis of the new diction. It can at most illustrate it. For the *Pleiade*, see Pellissier in *Petit de Julleville. Hist. de la Langue et de la Litt. Franç. T. III. ch. iv.*; also *La Pleiade Françoyse*. Ed. Marty-Laveaux: *Appendices*. For the *Areop.*, C. H. Herford, ed. *Shep. Cal.* Introd. IV; A. S. Cook. Ed. *Defense of Poesy*: Introd., § 4. But a full study of Spenserian language and grammar is still a desideratum.

² *La Deffence*, ed. cit., p. 57. (Parte II, ch. 11.)

³ *Tears of the Muses*, vv. 565 ff.

⁴ *Def. of Poesy*, ed. cit., pp. 44-5. This must be added as a third parallel to the two passages from Ronsard and Spenser quoted ante, pp. 435-6.

this that the gospel of the New Poetry was limited to Gentlemen and Scholars.

Scholars and Gentlemen might especially be expected to savor the bouquet of an old word as rich and rare as an old wine. In regard to archaism, however, there were no doubt two opinions in both clubs. Du Bellay and Sidney deprecated immoderate or constant archaism, Sidney actually not daring to 'allow' 'that same framing of his style to an old rustic language' of the *Shepheards Calender*.¹ Whether indeed the rusticity or antiquity of the language it was that displeased Sidney may be a question. And certainly in both his and Du Bellay's works there is evident archaism.² Ronsard, on the other hand, and only Ronsard, can rival Spenser in his enthusiasm for antique words . . . 'Mes enfants deffendez vostre mere de ceux qui veulent faire servante une damoysele de bonne maison. Il y a des vocables qui sont françois naturels, qui sentent le vieux, mais le libre françois . . . Je vous recommande par testament que vous ne laissiez point perdre ces vieux termes, que vous les employiez et deffendiez hardiment contre des maraux qui ne tiennent pas elegant ce qui nest point escorché du latin et de l'italien . . .'³ Lowell has noted⁴ the similarity of tone between Du Bellay's *Deffence* and the *Epistle* to the *Shepheards Calender*, but E. K.'s words are really much nearer those of Ronsard's. Defending Spenser's archaism, E. K. says: 'In my opinion it is one special prayse of many, whych are dew to this Poete, that he hath laboured to restore,

¹ *Defense of Poesie*, p. 47.

² 'His (Spenser's) theory, *caught from Bellay*, of rescuing good archaisms from unwarranted oblivion, was excellent; not so his practice of being archaic for the mere sake of escaping from the common and familiar.' Lowell, *Prose Wks.*, 'Riverside' ed., 1890, iv, 347. Lowell's distinction here between Du Bellay and Spenser is precisely that between Du Bellay (and Sidney) and Ronsard. But on the whole, both *Pleiade* and *Areopagus* did try to escape from the 'common and familiar' in language. As Pellissier puts it, *le but des novateurs est de donner à la poésie une langue distincte de la prose*. *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

³ *Avertissement des Tragiques*. (Quoted by Pellissier, *op. cit.*, p. 160.)

⁴ *Prose Wks.* 'Riverside' ed., 1890, iv, 346-7.

as to theyre rightfull heritage, such good and naturall English words, as have ben long time out of use, and almost cleane disherited. Which is the onely cause, that our Mother tongue, which truely of it self is both ful enough for prose, and stately enough for verse, hath long time ben counted most bare and barrein of both. Which default whenas some endeoured to salve and recure, they patched up the holes with peces and rags of other languages, borrowing here of the French, there of the Italian, every where of the Latine . . .'¹

If within *Pleiade* and *Arcopagus* alike there was a corresponding difference of opinion as to the degree of archaism proper for the new poetic diction, on the second 'home-spun' enrichment of the vernacular there was apparent disagreement as to its use at all. I mean terms and phrases from provincial dialects. Du Bellay ignores it in the *Deffence*; Ronsard warmly recommends it,² but employs it very sparingly; Spenser conspicuously uses it in the *Calender* for 'Doric' rusticity;³ Sidney explicitly censures Spenser's use of it. On the whole, this particular innovation could hardly prosper in the hands of courtly poets in a courtly atmosphere. As an eclectic theorist, Ronsard might insist that '*chacun jardin a sa par-*

¹ Prof. Kittredge has called to my attention another member of the *Arcopagus*, Harvey himself, who was given to archaising. T. Nash in *Strange Newes of the Intercepting Certaine Letters*, Epist.-Ded. to Harvey, alludes to the latter's 'wonted Chaucerisme' (Wks. ed. Grosart, vol. II, p. 175), and again recommends to his butt,—'Let Chaucer bee new scourd against the day of bataille' (p. 180).

² For instance: 'Je te conseille d'user indifferemment de tous dialectes; entre lesquels le courtisan est tous jours le plus beau, a cause de la majesté du prince; mais il ne peut estre parfait sans l'aide des autres, car chacun jardin a sa particuliere fleur,' etc. (*Pref. to Franciade.*)

³ Dr. Grosart has given currency to the view that Spenser's diction is full of North Country dialect. He has not made out his case, however. Prof. Kittredge assures me that there is no dialect in Spenser outside the *Calender*. Even in pastoral, Spenser gradually works away from 'Doric' rusticity. In his second considerable effort in the form, *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, there is hardly any trace of this affected naturalism; in his last pastoral strain in Bk. VI of the *Fairie Queene*, there is none whatever,—probably because of Sidney's *Arcadia*, which Spenser had evidently been reading.

ticuliere fleur'; in experience, however, courtly roses must find country wild flowers rank. It may be noted, however, that the attitude of *Pleiade* and *Areopagus* towards dialect was the same.

'Learned' accretions to the vocabulary consist of terms or phrases (1) naturalized, (2) technical, (3) newly coined. Such are the explicit prescriptions of Du Bellay and Ronsard¹; they may be shown to abound in the diction of the members of the *Areopagus*, even frequent upon the lips of Spenser's *soi-disant* rustics. These 'uncouth, unkiste' gentry carry their coppers in *crumenalls* (Sh. Cal., ix, 119). True humanists, they reject the vulgarism *flower deluce*, noting that *Flos delitiarum* must give *flowre delice* (iv, 144). Italianate, they are not *tired*, but *stanck* (ix, 47). Frenchified,² their sun does not scorch the *open plain*, but the *playne overture* (vii, 28). Versed in lore architectural, these peasant foreheads are not *wrinkled*, but *chamfred*, *by time* (ii, 43).³ If Spenser can make 'shepherds' talk so, we need hardly doubt the 'learned' diction of his knights, and ladies. And in fact Spenser is one of the richest word-makers in English. Greek, Latin, Italian, French words find themselves transmogrified to fit their alien surroundings. Generally, the originals of these naturalized terms are recognizable; sometimes the disguise is impenetrable, or nearly.⁴ Of technical terms Spenser introduces most freely legal; but from commerce he draws *handsell*, from heraldry *diapred*, from music *minime*, *divide* (to execute floridly), from archery *the mounenance of a flight*, and so on. New-coinages are ticklish things to

¹ For proofs and examples, see Pellissier, loc. cit., pp. 158-163; Lanson, pp. 277-8.

² 'The word is borrowed from the French and used of good writers.'—E. K.

³ Cf. C. H. Herford. *Spenser's Shep. Cal.* Macmillan, 1898. Introd., sect. IV. Prof. Herford declares that 'Spenser was from first to last an innovator in poetic speech' (p. xlviii).

⁴ For instance, the curious *parts entire* (*Amor.* 6, II) means *inward parts*. Murray explains *entire* as from *interior*; but it is at least noteworthy that Petrarch, whom the poet of the *Amoretti* had been reading, has *parti interne* (son. 58 *in vita di M. L.*).

pronounce on, but the hybrid *dreeriment* is credited to Spenser by Herford; *dismayd* (deformed) looks original, although it may be a vulgarism; *emperst* (pierced through) has been overlooked in the New Oxford Dictionary; *cuffling* (scuffling) is apparently unique; *easterland* (Dutch *oosterling*?) does not appear in N. O. D. In fine, while it is not here possible to go into satisfactory detail, there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt of Spenser's having consciously embellished English in very much the same degree and kind as the *Pleiade* did French.

Diction so enriched, the next step towards a higher poetic style is to ennoble language in its relationships of words, in its syntax. Here elevation is next door to affectation. In an analytical language like French or English departures from the usual syntax must be confined within narrow limits or become unintelligible or absurd. In fact Sidney in the *Arcadia* has constructions that are very nearly both. For the most part, however, *Areopagus* and *Pleiade* held fairly aloof from a really 'precious' syntax, although their desire in common to be as unusual as possible led naturally towards the 'precious.' To be unusual in syntax means specifically to make one part of speech play the rôle of another, or to put one clause of the sentence where another naturally belongs. These two devices are exhaustive. Du Bellay specially recommends both in the *Deffence*.¹ We find both copiously employed by the members of the *Areopagus*,—with Sidney even in prose.²

Taking diction and syntax together, the *Areopagus* certainly outwent the *Pleiade* in the latter's own innovation. Spenser went farthest in archaic diction; Sidney was rivalled only by Du Bartas in the invention and use of compound terms. Ronsard is explicit in recommending

¹ See conveniently Pellissier, l. c., pp. 163-5.

² Herford's brief discussion of Spenser's syntax in ed. *Shep. Cal.*, Introd., § 23, and H. M. Percival's in ed. *F. Q. I.* (London, 1894), pp. lxii-lxv, both, as far as they go, confirm my point. But for purposes of final comparison we need a full study such as given in the admirable linguistic Appendixes to Marty-Laveaux: ed. *Pleiade*.

such formations: ' *Tu composeras hardiment des mots à l'imitation des Grecs et des Latins, pourveu qu'ils soient gracieux et plaisants à l'oreille.*'¹ Pellissier indeed insists that the immediate *Pleiade* was relatively moderate in these formations. If so, much stress must be laid on the 'relatively.' Marty-Laveaux in *Appendice 2* gives a long list of such terms, from which I cull two or three: *la tempeste* . . . *sifloit* AIGU-TOURNOYANT (Ronsard), *Daimon* AIME-DANCE (Baïf), *tes lieures* AUX-PIÉS-VISTES (Ronsard), *Tu nourris un grand* CHASSE-MOUCHE (a beard!) (Ronsard), *porc* GASTE-RAISIN (Bellay), R'ENCONTRE-BALANCER (verb) (Ronsard), *vent* SOUFFLE-CHARBON (Ronsard). For the *Areopagus* Sidney is perhaps more daring than Spenser,² but Spenser has two or three such compounds on almost every page. Although perhaps excessive in number, his compounds are rarely extravagant and often very effective, as *to* THUNDER-DRIVE *to hell* (F. Q. 7, 6, 30), *DEAW-BURNING blade* (F. Q. 1, 11, 35), *FROTH-FOMY steed* (F. Q. 1, 11, 23); sometimes they are awkward as GORE-BLOOD (clotted? blood. F. Q. 2, 1, 39), DEAD-DOING hand (F. Q. 2, 3, 8); GROUND-WORK, SNAKIE-PACED, and THUNDER-DARTES occur in translation from Du Bellay; LUKE-WARM and LIGHT-FOOT correspond to Baïf's TIEDE-CHAUD and Jodelle's PIÉ-LEGER.³

This overlaying of the vernacular with costly word and rare phrase was still insufficient. The New Poetry was child-like in its craving for more and more magnificence. Bartholomew Aneau, presumptive author of the *Quintil Horatian*, takes the *Pleiade* particularly to task for this extravagance of taste. He compares the coterie to children 'qui estiment plus bel habillement un hocqueton orfaverizé d'archier de la garde qu'une saye de velours uniforme avec quelques riches boutons d'or clair semez.'⁴ Precisely so Lowell decides that Spenser 'was an epicure in language, . . . loved "seld-seen costly" words perhaps

¹ *Abrégé d'Art Poétique*.

² Cook, ed. *Defense of Poesie*, Introd., pp. xxiv-xxv.

³ It is possible that other compounds by Spenser or Sidney might turn out to be translations from the *Pleiade*. I have not found time to carry out the comparison.

⁴ Quoted in Petit de Julleville, III, 168.

too well.' Two other 'ennobling' devices then are to be added to those already noted,—both devices of expansion, adding, one might say, ampleness to opulence of style. These devices are (1) allusion, especially classical, and (2) paraphrase.

The innovation here—even more than in the case of syntax—is of course not of kind, but degree. The New Poetry, both French and English, simply bristled with classical allusion, grew fairly dropsical with circumlocution and paraphrase. Spenser's wealth of classical allusion so imposed upon his contemporaries that some of them accounted him more a classical scholar than a poet. Thomas Lodge, for instance, in a remarkably pregnant passage of his '*Wits Miserie*' (1596), writes: 'Divine wits, for many things as all antiquity (I speak it not on slight surmise, but considerate judgment) . . . Lilly, the famous for facility in discourse: *Spenser, best read in Ancient Poetry*: Daniel, choice in word, and invention: Draiton, diligent and formall: Th. Nash, true English Aretine.' So the 'virtue'—as Pater says—of Spenser was for Lodge neither wit nor wisdom, neither charm nor high seriousness, not any of the romantic graces for which he has been a power in literature since, but—*classical scholarship*. In effect, the Trimmer had been mistaken for one of the Philistines, the slavish humanists.

On the classical allusiveness of the *Pleiade*, besides its prescription in their programmes, the most amusing self-criticism of the abuse of the device is given by Ronsard himself at the close of his laboriously futile epic:

Les Francois qu' mes vers liront,
S'ils ne sont et Grecs et Romains,
En lieu de ce livre ils n'auront
Qu'un pesant faix entre les mains.

On the second embellishment, paraphrase, Du Bellay is pleasantly naïve. 'Entre autres choses ie t'aduerty' vser souuent de la figure ANTONOMASIE, aussi frequente aux anciens Poëtes, comme peu vsitée, voire incongneue des Francoys. La grace d'elle est quand on designe le Nom

de quelque chose par ce qui luy est propre, comme le Pere foudroyant, pour Iupiter: le Dieu deux fois né, pour Bacchus; le vierge Chasseresse, pour Dyane. Cete figure a beaucoup d'autres especes, que tu trouuerras ches les Rhetoriciens, & a fort bonne grace principalement aux descriptions, comme: Depuis ceux qui voyent premiers rougir l'Aurore, iusques la ou Thetis recoit en ses Vndes le fils d'Hyperion; pour, depuis l'Orient iusques a l'Occident.'¹ The very fulness of Du Bellay's explanation proves how much the now outworn device was for his contemporaries an innovation.

I take it hardly necessary to prove paraphrase of the kind indicated by Du Bellay, a favorite mannerism of the author of the *Arcadia*. One of the most famous examples, however, may serve as a reminder. I mean that huntsmen in *Arcadia* do not come home 'in the evening,' but 'about the time that the candle begins to inherit the sun's office.' As for Spenser, Warton bears indirect testimony to the extreme use of paraphrase by Spenser by classifying it as the first of three 'most striking and obvious' of 'many absurdities' into which the length and complexity of the Spenserian stanza forced its inventor. Warton's statement is one of those monumental ineptitudes into which ignorance of fact will sometimes betray even great critics, but it sufficiently serves the present need. Spenser's stanza 'obliged (!) him to dilate the thing to be expressed, however unimportant, with trifling and tedious circumlocution, viz.

Now hath fair Phoebe, with her silver face,
Thrice seen the shadows of this nether world,
Sith last I left that honourable place,
In which her royal presence is enroll'd.' 2, 3, 44.

That is, 'it is three months since I left her palace.'

¹ *La Deffence*, chap. ix, ed. cit., p. 51.

² *Observations on the Fairie Queene*, Vol. I, Sect. 10. Lowell (Essay on Spenser. Prose Wks., Riverside Ed., IV, 329), by a slip attributes this criticism to Joseph Warton. He justifies Spenser's device aesthetically, but fails to note any influence of the previous French revival of the device.

Enrichment of the language (*l'illustration de la langue*) is at length provided for. The New Poet has now at his pen's point a vocabulary at once refined and enlarged, a syntax choice almost to 'preciousness,' a rhetoric of stately swells and ingenious tropes and 'ancient instances.' There remains to set all this fury of fine sound to a music which shall at once fit and enhance its noble utterance.

In the New Versification we find *Pleiade* and *Areopagus* again prescribing and employing 'trimming' formulae. Against the slavish Humanists, apes of classical regularity, pitifully counting their just ten syllables, beating time to a rigid iambic monotone, pausing with insistence always after their second iamb, Spenser already in his first published work, the *Shepheards Calender*, asserts the sovereign right-of-ear against that slavish rule-of-thumb.¹ So the *Pleiade*,—which, says M. Pellissier, 'laisse au goût, au sens rythmique, au jugement de l'oreille, autant de latitude que peuvent le permettre les nécessités de la métrique.'²

Against the opposite extreme, on the other hand,—the popular rhymers timing their tune to the tinkle of a tambourine,—*Pleiade* and *Areopagus* are scornful enough. 'Ly donquies, & rely premierement, (ô Poëte futur), fueillette de Main nocturne & iournelle, les Exemplaires Grecz & Latins, puis me laisse toutes ces veilles Poësies Francoyses aux Ieuz Floraux de Toulouze, & au puy de Rouan: comme Rondeaux, Ballades, Vyrelaiz, Chantz Royaulx, Chansons, & autres telles episseries . . .'³ The opinion of the *Areopagus* is sufficiently indicated in that part of its purpose which Spenser communicated to Harvey: . . . 'they (Sidney and Dyer) have proclaimed in their ἀρειωπύῳ a generall surceasing and silence of balde Rymers, . . . and (have) drawn mee to their faction.'⁴

¹ For a full and highly interesting proof of this statement see É. Légouis. *Quomodo Edmundus Spenserius ad Chaucerum se fingens in eclogis 'The Shepheards Calender' versum heroicum renovavit ac refecerit.* Paris, 1896.

² Petit de Julleville, III, 169.

³ *La Deffence*, ed. cit., P. II, ch. iv, p. 38.

⁴ Du Bellay (*la Deffence*, P. II, ch. xi, ed. cit., p. 54) condemns those bad poets who have given 'le ridicule nom de RYMEURS à nostre Langue (comme les Latins appellent leurs mauuais poetes Versificateurs).'

Theoretically, the members of the *Areopagus* seem to have discussed seriously offsetting 'balde rymes' by so-called classical metres in English. Practically, they never published a verse of the 'reformed versification.' Spenser's one extant specimen occurs in a letter to Harvey published by the latter. The *Arcadia*, which contains Sidney's ventures in the kind, was published ostensibly after his death and against his will. The *Pleiade*, on the other hand, if its two chief members hardly attempt to *françiser* classical metres (Ronsard has two odes in sapphics), nevertheless has in Baïf an innovator in this line who went much farther than any of the *Areopagus*. Baïf not only advocated the adoption of classical metres for French poetry, but also made that advocacy one of the main tenets of his *Academy of Music and Poetry*, and published much in the peculiar eclectic compromise-verse which owes to him its name. Even, therefore, if we unintelligently limit the business of the *Areopagus* to its 'reformed versification,' we shall still find its immediate forerunner in the *Pleiade*.

The really significant 'reformed versification,' however, of *Areopagus* and *Pleiade* alike was one that substituted for 'balde rymes'—'fourteeners' or their French analogues—rich and varied stanzas, keeping to the national rhyme-principle but developing its monotonous sing-song into the rich harmonies of which its capabilities had had before been unsuspected, until the new rhymed stanza rivalled the classical strophe itself. Moreover, as Ronsard permanently established the Alexandrine, which he prophetically asserted to hold 'la place en notre langue, telle que les vers heroique entre les Grecs et les Latins,'¹ precisely so we find Légouis proving Spenser to have revived and improved English *versum heroicum*.²

¹ Lanson, op. cit., p. 276.

² Specific metrical imitations of the *Pleiade* by the *Areopagus* I neither affirm nor deny. I have not sufficiently compared. Interesting analogies indeed are not wanting. Compare, for instance, the April *Hymn to Eliza* in the *Shepheards Calender* with the *Chorus* to the Queen-Mother in Ronsard's first Eclogue, in which—apart from other resemblances,—the peculiar met-

All is ready now for the final labor of the New Poet, at last equipped with a voice and an instrument: having learned how to sing, there remains the question 'what to sing. I must necessarily be brief; to be exhaustive would require almost as many monographs as there are genres represented by the two coteries. Pellissier, summing up the answer of the *Pleiade* to this question 'What to sing?' says: 'Ce sont les grands genres dont Ronsard et ses disciples veulent doter notre poésie, et, s'ils cultivent aussi les genres inférieurs, ils prétendent y porter une noblesse, une élévation, une dignité que leurs devanciers ne soupçonnaient même pas.'¹ Substitute here for 'Ronsard' 'Spenser,' and the proposition remains true.

The eclectic method of the *Pleiade* is nowhere more pronounced than in the *Deffence*, II, iv-v, in which Du Bellay discusses the choice of genres. Of the classical genres to be imitated, he enjoins 'Odes, incongues encor' de la Muse Francoyse, . . . Epistres, . . . Elegies, . . . Satyres, . . . Sonnets, . . . ces plaisantes Ecclogues Rustiques à l'exemple de Thëocrit & de Virgile: Marines,² à l'exemple de Sennazar Gentilhomme Neapolitain. Que pleust aux Muses, qu'en toutes les Especies de Poesie que i'ay nommées nous eussions beaucoup de telles imitations, qu'est cete Ecclogue sur la naissance du filz de Monseigneur le Dauphin, à mon gré vn des meilleurs petiz Ouraiges que fist onques Marot.' Du Bellay completes his list of minor genres with short mention of classical Comedies and Tragedies.

rical effects are very like. Again, it is at least curious that the *Fairie Queene* stanza can be resolved into two 'interlinked' quatrains, Marot's favorite measure, plus an Alexandrine, Ronsard's favorite (ababbcbcb+C). Doubtless, Spenser chose the longer concluding verse to avoid the smart emphasis of the heroic couplet. Still, the possible resolution is aptly symbolic of the new eclecticism.

¹ Petit de Julleville, III, 156.

² This recommendation was literally followed out by P. Fletcher, Spenser's immediate disciple, in the former's *Piscatorie Eclogues*, largely imitations of Sannazaro.

In accord with Du Bellay's meaning,¹ Spenser wrote 'Odes' before unknown to the English Muse. He did not indeed ape Pindar. That was reserved for Cowley. But in the revival of the Greek philosophical Hymn² and the formal *Epithalamion*, Spenser very closely follows Ronsard.

Of virtually all the other minor genres advised by Du Bellay the *Areopagus* has specimens, but with the exception of evident imitations from Du Bellay's *Olive* sonnet-sequence in the *Amoretti*³ and a point or two about the Eclogues, I have nothing presently in mind that seems to add to my argument. Du Bellay's very urgent recommendation of the eclectically imitated Eclogue, however, seems to me significant in view of the choice made by the young Spenser among his early productions for a first bow to the public. *The Shepheards Calender* is perhaps the most eclectically imitative poem, or set of poems, in the language. 'E. K.' cites in his *Epistle* the models suggested by Du Bellay, but outdoes him by three. 'So flew Theocritus, . . . Virgile, . . . Mantuane, . . . Petrarque, . . . Boccace, . . . Marot, Sanazarus, and also divers other excellent both Italian and French Poetes, whose foting this Author every where followeth; yet so as few, but they be wel sented, can trace him out.' It

¹ The *Quintil Horatian* justly, but irrelevantly, denied the literal priority of the *Pleiade's* 'Odes.' 'Vray est que le nom Ode a esté incogneu comme peregrin & Grec escorché . . . mais le nom de chant & chanson est bien cogneu & receu comme François.'

² Spenser's *Fowre Hymns* were written under different circumstances than most of Ronsard's. The *Fowre Hymns*, therefore, are free from the courtly sycophancy which mars too many of Ronsard's, but that mood is easily supplied elsewhere in Spenser. Both sets of *Hymns* are saturated with Neo-Platonic metaphysics. Ronsard follows more closely the scheme of Callimachus, but that Spenser also studied Callimachus is likely from the fact that he probably derived the name *Britomarte* from him. (He *may* have got it indeed from Lucan's 'True History'.)

³ The eclectic compromise in Spenser's sonnet-structure is to be noted, also that his form is based, like his *Fairie Queene* stanza, upon Marot's interlinked quatrains, which Spenser directly took from Marot in the 'November' Eclogue. Thus Spenser's ababbcbccdcdee mediates between the periodic Italian abbaabbacdecde and the loose Elizabethan ababedcddefeggg.

may be over-finesse to note in passing the French form given to the names of Petrarch and Boccaccio; but it is not so, I think, to ask who 'E. K.' means by 'other excellent . . . French Poetes' in the Eclogue, if not the poets of the *Pleiade*. What others were there? Du Bellay's warm praise of the Eclogue of Marot is the more noteworthy since Marot was the leader of the professed foes of the New School. Assuming that Spenser was studying the *Deffence*, he must naturally have been struck by Du Bellay's generous praise of his arch rival, and would no less naturally turn to Marot's Eclogues for inspiration for his own experiments in kind. In point of fact, Spenser's two last Eclogues in the *Calender* are virtual paraphrases respectively of Marot's¹ Eclogue on the death of Madame Loÿse and of his Eclogue entitled *Pan et Robin*.

With due sense of the solemnity of the matter Du Bellay opens his discussion of the major genre of poetry,—the heroic or epic,—with a glowing appeal to the not impossible New Poet.² 'Donques, ô toy qui doué d'une excellente felicité de Nature, instruit de tous bons Ars & Sciences, principalement Naturelles & Mathematiques, versé en tous genres de bons Auteurs Grecz & Latins, non ignorant des parties & offices de la vie humaine, non de trop haulte condition, 'ou appellé au regime publicq', non aussi abiect & pauvre, non troublé d'affaires domestiques: mais en repoz & tranquillité d'esprit, acquise premierement par la magnanimité de ton courage, puis entretenue par ta prudence & saige gouuernement: ô toy (dy-ie) orné de tant de graces & perfections, si tu as quelquefois pitie de ton pauvre Langaige, si tu daignes l'enrichir de tes Thesors, ce sera toy veritablement qui luy feras hausser la Teste, & d'un braue Sourcil s'egaler aux superbes Langues Greque & Latine, comme a faict de nostre Tens en son vulgaire un Arioste Italien. . . '

This summons must have touched the young Spenser

¹ 'E. K.' acknowledges the indebtedness to Marot of the 'Nov.' Ecl., but not of the 'Dec.'

² *Deffence*, II, ch. v, ed. cit., p. 41.

very nearly. His situation curiously accorded with Du Bellay's requirements; he had ample confidence that he was poet-born. E. K.'s *Epistle*, as we have seen, proves with what self-conscious ardor Spenser set about to restore and exalt his '*pauvre Langaige*.' And to Harvey: 'Why a God's name, may not we, as else the Greeks, have the kingdom of our own language?' As for emulating Ariosto, hear Harvey: 'I am voyde of al iudgement if your Nine Comedies . . . come not nearer Ariostoes Comoedies, . . . that that Elvish Queene doth to his Orlando Furioso, which notwithstanding, you will needes seeme to emulate, and hope to overgo, as you flatly professed yourself in one of your last Letters.'¹

Du Bellay continues: 'Comme luy (Ariosto) donq', qui a bien voulu emprunter de notre Langue les Noms & l'Hystoire de son Poëme, choysi moi quelqu'un de ces beaux vieux Romans Francoys, comme vn Lancelot, vn Tristan, ou autres: & en fay renaitre au monde vn admirable Iliade, & laborieuse Eneide . . .'

'I chose,' writes Spenser to Raleigh, 'the historie of King Arthure . . . in which (principle of selection) I have followed all the antique Poets historicall; first Homere, . . . then Virgil, . . . after him Ariosto . . .'²

Du Bellay continues: 'Je veux bien en passant dire un mot a ceulx qui ne s'employent qu'a orner & amplifier notz Romans, & en font des Liures certainement en beau & fluide Langaige, mais beaucoup plus propre a bien entretenir Damoizelles, qu'a doctement ecrire: ie voudroy' bien (dy-ie) les avertir d'employer cete grande Eloquence a recueillir ces fragmentz de vieilles Chroniques Francoyses . . .'

Spenser's treatment of his Romance-material is preëmi-

¹ Harvey Wks., ed. Grosart, I. p. 95.

² Ronsard in an analogous passage of his Preface to the *Franciade* mentions the Romance of Arthur by name. (See Wks., ed. Paris, 1858, T. III, p. 23.) Spenser seems also to have borrowed very considerably from the *Huon de Bordeaux*, '*un de ces beaux vieux Romans Francoys*.' (See J. L. OF GERMANIC PHIL., Vol. II, 1888, No. 2.)

nently moralistic and learned¹ ('*doctement écrire*'). And in FQ. 2, 10, and 3, 3, he summarises the old English Chronicle of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Ronsard's explanation of his epic methods in the *Preface* to the *Franciade* is half echo, half expansion of Du Bellay's in the *Deffence*. *A priori*, therefore, we might expect some degree of similarity between the *Franciade* and the *Fairie Queene*. The expectation is illogical. A new factor enters into the personal, not to say national, equation. The elements in common, however, are easily distinguishable. Ronsard and Spenser both avowedly set out to overgo Ariosto, whom they both mistake for an epic-maker in direct descent from Homer and Virgil; both imitators derive from the *Orlando Furioso* their common motif of recounting the exploits and progeny of certain mythical Trojan-descended ancestors of the ruling House—Ronsard in *Francion*, Spenser in *Artegal* and *Britomart*; to this end Ronsard uses the national chronicle of Jean le Maire, *Illustrations des Gaules et Antiquités de Troie*,—Spenser uses his *Briton Moniments*, i. e. the Chronicle of Geoffrey, and the mythical *Antiquitee of Faery Lond*. Both poets use the romantic material of single combat with invulnerable giants, Ronsard once,² Spenser many times; both are fond of personified abstractions and virtues and vices³; both introduce the allegorical pageant, or *Trionfo*.⁴ In method, both retard the narrative by interminable descriptions.

¹ Professor Dowden notices another important relation between Sidney and Spenser, the two leading *Areopagites*. 'In the spirit of Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie Spenser conceived and wrote the Faery Queen. It is an attempt to harmonize the three divisions of learning discussed by Sidney—history, moral philosophy, poetry; and to make the first and second of these subserve the greatest of the three.' (Spenser's Wks., ed. Grosart, I, 319) Note, by the way, the further proof of Spenser's 'harmonizing,' that is eclectic, tendency.

² *Francion* vs. *Oree*. Liv., III.

³ E. g. Love and his companions on the Venus-girdle, *Franciade*, Liv. III (ed. cit., Ronsard, *Oeuvres*, T. III, p. 163). Ronsard's '*Jalousie*' (Liv. III, p. 184) is strikingly like Spenser's '*Ate*' (FQ. 4, 1) or '*Envy*' (5, 12).

⁴ Ronsard: Pageant of '*Victoire*,' Liv. III (p. 158 ff.). Spenser: e. g. *Masque of Cupid*. FQ. 3, 12.

At the apogee of the Renaissance in France and England stand two eclectic schools of literature, each with a quasi-propagandist organization and a distinct and innovating programme. Each organization is named after a Greek organization. The programme in each case starts from a rehabilitation of the true function of poetry, based upon Plato's *Poetics*. From this major premiss in common both programmes proceed to a 'poetic diction' built from a vocabulary expanded and ennobled by archaic, technical and imported terms and to a more or less 'cultist' syntax, opulently allusive and circumlocutory, all to be set to a new orchestration of rhyme in conformity with classical strophes and Italian stanzas. Both programmes then enjoin the same genres and the same, or nationally analogous, models. Finally, complementing parallelism of abstract programme follows a concrete poetical performance, different only in so far as may be explained by difference of national and individual temperament.

I doubt if these coincidences be fortuitous. Certainly I know of no third source for them. Ascham, indeed, recommended some things,—the literary use of the vernacular and the abandonment of rhyme,—which the *Areopagus* seems to follow. Ascham's precept was, however, 'to write as common people do'¹: certainly, however much the *Areopagus* may have aspired to think as wise people do, the very last thing in their intention was to write as common people do. As for Ascham's proscription of rhyme, the sufficient answer is that *Areopagus* in their works did not proscribe, but prescribe, rhyme. If it be objected that the *Pleiade* is not explicitly recognized by the *Areopagus* as its model, I can only answer that neither Spenser nor Sidney, nor Elizabethans in general, bothered much about such formal recognitions. The fact, they might have said, spoke for itself. Professor Herford has well said that it might almost seem as if 'Spenser borrowed from Chaucer nothing but his sly way of

¹ *Toxophilus*.

acknowledging indebtedness chiefly where it was not due.''' In view, then, of Spenser's usual niggardliness of thanks, the following warm tribute to Du Bellay should count for more than merely perfunctory compliment :

Bellay, first garland of free Poesie
That France brought forth, though fruitfull of brave wits,
Well worthie thou of immortalitie,
That long hast traveld, by thy learned writs,
Olde Rome out of her ashes to revive,
And give a second life to dead decayes !
Needs must he all eternitie survive,
That can to other give eternall dayes :
Thy dayes therefore are endles, and thy prayse
Excelling all, that ever went before.

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER.

¹ Ed. *Sh. Cal.* Introd., p. xxxvii.